

Attorney Docket No.: P19-US

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 4, 2004 has been received and carefully considered by the applicants along with the references cited therin.

In the Office action, claims 1-55 and 124-132 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 56-58, 60-69, 71-72, 78-79, 94-96, and 106-108 were rejected under 35. U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Huibers, US 6,046,840. However, the Examiner indicated that claims 59, 70, 73-77, 80-93, 97-105, and 109-123 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above rejection was incorrect because Huibers neither teaches nor suggests applicants' invention as set forth in the above rejected claims. However, in order to further the prosecution of the present application and place this application in condition for allowance, applicant herein rewrites some of the allowable claims in independent form, and will further discuss the merits of the (non-amended) claims with the Examiner in a continuation application. Specifically, claim 56 has been amended to include all features recited in allowable claim 98 and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 98 is canceled, and claim 99 is amended to correct the dependency. Claim 106 has been amended to include all of the features recited in allowable claim 109 and any intervening claim. Claim 109 is canceled accordingly.

New claims 133-200 are presented as new claims. Of these claims, claims 133, 182, 183, and 184 are independent claims. Claims 133 and 182 are allowable claims 97 and 104 respectively rewritten in independent form (including subject matter of intervening claims, if any). Claims 183 and 184 are allowable claims 113 and 119 respectively rewritten in independent form (including subject matter of intervening claims, if any). Moreover, claims 97, 107, 108, 113, and 114 have been amended to improve the inconsistency in the usage of the terminology "adhesion reducing agent".

Claims 1-55 and 124-132, which were withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner, are cancelled herein (and will be further prosecuted in a divisional application).

The Examiner's help with this application is appreciated. The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully

Attorney Docket No.: P19-US
requested to pass this application to issue. In the event any fees are required in connection with this response, please charge our Deposit Account No. 501516.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory R. Muir
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,293

REFLECTIVITY, INC.
350 Potrero Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94085

Tel:(408) 737-8100 x136
Fax:(408) 737-8153